

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to each of the Examiner's rejections in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

1. Claims 19, 23, 27 and 31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Liegl (U.S. 2004/0121264) in view of Aoki (U.S. 2005/0237350).
2. Claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 32 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Liegl in view of Aoki and further in view of Yamagushi (U.S. 2006/0263722).
3. Claims 21, 25, 29 and 33 are rejected as being unpatentable over Liegl in view of Aoki and further in view of Bibl (2006/0007271).
4. Claims 13-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Liegl and Aoki and further in view of Park (U.S. 2003/0202132).
5. Claims 16-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Liegl, Aoki and Park and further in view of Hagino (U.S. 5,380,670).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claim 13 and 16 to recite the feature of "discharging a composition containing a photosensitizer on a first conductive layer to form a plurality of first resist patterns under reduced pressure." Independent Claim 19 has been amended in a similar fashion. Applicants are also amending independent Claim 23 to recite the feature of "performing ink jetting on an object to form a plurality of first resist patterns under reduced pressure." Independent Claim 27 is being amended to recite the feature of "discharging a composition on an object at pressure in the range of 1×10^2 Pa to 2×10^4 Pa to form a plurality of first resist patterns." Independent Claim 31 is being amended to recite the feature of "performing ink

jetting at pressure in the range of 1×10^2 Pa to 2×10^4 Pa to form a plurality of first resist patterns on an object.” Support for these claimed features can be found, for example, at page 2, line 20 - page 3, line 10 and page 5, line 16 - page 6, line 2 of the specification of the present application. Hence, no new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

In contrast, according to paragraph [0006] in Liegl, in this reference, the substrate is coated with a photosensitive layer having compounds dissolved in solvent. Then, “the solvent is evaporated without using elevated temperatures to reduce or eliminate roughness exhibited on the sidewalls of the photosensitive layer after development” (i.e. after spin-coating). According to paragraph [0014] in Liegl (which the Examiner cites in the rejections), in the reference, “the solvent of the resist layer is evaporated without using elevated temperatures” (emphasis added); the “solvent is removed by reducing the pressure of the environment”; and the “pressure of the environment can be, for example, about 1 Pa to less than 1×10^5 Pa”. This teaching in Liegl regarding reducing pressure is directed to after the resist layer is formed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Liegl does not disclose or suggest the above-claimed features. For example, Liegl does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of discharging a composition under reduced pressure (to form resist patterns). The other cited references also do not disclose or suggest these claimed features.

In addition, Applicants are amending independent Claim 13 to recite the features, in the exposing step, of “a first portion where the light is irradiated and a second portion where the light is not irradiated are formed in each of the plurality of first resist patterns;” and “removing one of the first portion and the second portion by developing the plurality of first resist patterns to form a plurality of second resist patterns.” Independent Claims 16, 19, 23, 27 and 31 have been amended in a similar manner. Support for these claimed features can be found, for example, at page 7, line 3 to

page 9, line 25 of the specification and Figs. 1A-1C of the present application. Hence, no new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

In contrast, none of the cited references appear to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Therefore, even if it were proper to combine the cited references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination would still fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Therefore, independent Claims 13, 16, 19, 23, 27 and 31 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 13, 16, 19, 23, 27 and 31 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568